



Written by [William P. Hoar](#) on December 23, 2019

Published in the December 23, 2019 issue of [the New American](#) magazine. Vol. 35, No. 24

Correction, Please!

Eco-omen: The End Is Nigh — Again

Item: On November 20, the Associated Press reported that former Vice President Al Gore had “kicked off a series of climate presentations” slated to “continue around the globe.” Termed “24 Hours of Reality,” the series is “an endeavor of The Climate Reality Project, founded by Gore to educate the public and inspire action on climate change.”



In one presentation, in New Jersey, Gore was quoted (by a CBS affiliate) as saying: “This is Pearl Harbor. This is Midway. This is the Battle of [the] Bulge. This is 9/11. We have to rise to this challenge. We have to change.” He used virtually the same language in a speech in Tennessee where, the AP reported, “Gore called climate change ‘the life and death struggle of people alive today.’”

Gore also “expressed his support for the so-called Green New Deal. Noted the AP, the GND, among other goals, “calls for virtual elimination of greenhouse gas emissions responsible for global warming by 2030.”

Item: In a special “Climate Issue,” dated September 21-27, the London-based Economist called for decarbonizing the world’s economy, while acknowledging that would require “a near-complete overhaul.” The publication did grant that climate change “is not the end of the world.” Still, it seems that the Economist sees it as being pretty close to that. Climate change, the editors insisted, is “a dire threat to countless people — one that is planetary in scope if not in its absolute stakes. It will displace tens of millions, at the very least; it will disrupt farms on which billions rely; it will dry up wells and water mains; it will flood low-lying places — and, as time goes by, higher-standing ones, too.... [And the longer that] humanity takes to curb emissions, the greater the dangers and sparser the benefits — and the larger the risk of some truly catastrophic surprises.”

Item: An article on Bloomberg.com for November 5 set off an “urgent alarm,” declaring: “More than 11,000 experts from around the world are calling for a critical addition to the main strategy of dumping fossil fuels for renewable energy: there needs to be far fewer humans on the planet,” wrote Eric Roston. The piece cited a warning published in the journal BioScience.

Item: Writing for CNN on November 8, actor Robert Redford said that President Trump had just “notified the United Nations of his intention to pull America out of the most significant climate effort in history, the now-famous Paris Accord.” Redford, also identified as a trustee of the Natural Resources Defense Council, called this “a decision that has shocked millions with its short-sighted foolishness.”

In his conclusion, Redford railed: “We can’t allow one unqualified authoritarian’s depraved indifference to the climate crisis define Americans’ commitments or the character of our nation.”

Correction: It’s good to have scientists to tell us that the universe is made up of protons, electrons, and



Written by [William P. Hoar](#) on December 23, 2019

Published in the December 23, 2019 issue of [the New American](#) magazine. Vol. 35, No. 24

neutrons. Sometimes, however, they forget the morons; for that we can apparently depend on outraged grizzled actors, past office-bearers pretending to be wizzes, and, inevitably, editorial avatars in the left-wing mass media.

President Trump's actions to withdraw from the Paris Climate Agreement have led to a panic-stricken overreaction in some quarters. Keep in mind that President Obama didn't submit this to the Senate as a treaty, as other countries did, because he knew it wouldn't be ratified.

Symbolic at best, here is what the agreement was aimed at: a global temperature reduction of 0.17 degree Celsius (.306 degrees Fahrenheit). As summarized by Benjamin Zycher, a resident scholar at the American Enterprise Institute, that figure is the

temperature reduction in 2100 attendant upon the Paris greenhouse gas emissions reduction, which is the simple sum of the promises ("Nationally Determined Contributions") made by the participating countries. The U.S. contribution to that "achievement": 0.015 degree Celsius. These figures are the modeling results using the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency climate model. There is no dispute about them.

That global 0.17 degree Celsius includes the ostensible effects of the Obama 2015 pseudo-agreement with China, if it is meaningful. (It is not.) The Chinese promise that their greenhouse gas emissions will peak "around 2030." How high will that peak be? No one knows. What will their emissions be after the peak? No one knows. What will happen if, or when, their emissions continue to rise after "around 2030"? Actually, we do know the answer to that: nothing.

If the agreement were fully implemented (which it will not be), it would cost annually, as Zycher writes, "at least 1 percent of global GDP, or \$850 billion or more per year, inflicted disproportionately upon the world's poor."

While pro-Paris liberals have recently been carping about the United States abdicating its international duties, Trump's decision to leave the agreement was a sovereign decision intended for the best interests of our country. This was emphasized by Secretary of State Mike Pompeo, who pointed out that the United States

has reduced all types of emissions, even as we grow our economy and ensure our citizens' access to affordable energy. Our results speak for themselves: U.S. emissions of criteria air pollutants that impact human health and the environment declined by 74% between 1970 and 2018. U.S. net greenhouse gas emissions dropped 13% from 2005-2017, even as our economy grew over 19 percent.

No advanced country is meeting its Paris pledges, according to the Climate Action Tracker. However, that doesn't mean the feverish advocates of the Green New Deal have lowered their incessant demands. Consider, among other points, the goals of Democratic presidential candidates Bernie Sanders and Joe Biden, who seek to ban fossil fuels. Doing so would (as demonstrated in a study by the American Petroleum Institute) destroy the jobs of 10.3 million Americans.

The scientific crusaders of climate change — as noted in the *BioScience* excerpt above — say the planet faces a "climate emergency," but we have heard this before. In this case, however, it is interesting to note some of the signatories, as discovered by an environmental reporter for the *Australian* newspaper in November. Dozens of names were removed when it was found that their fellow signatories included, among others, Harry Potter's headmaster Albus Dumbledore from Hogwarts (Harry's fictional alma



Written by [William P. Hoar](#) on December 23, 2019

Published in the December 23, 2019 issue of [the New American](#) magazine. Vol. 35, No. 24

mater) and Mickey Mouse from the Mickey Mouse School of the Blind, Namibia. (On the form, the name was rendered as “Micky”.) There is, as it happens, a lot of fiction in the climate-change field.

One of the actual “contributing reviewers” of this effort (a project of the Alliance of World Scientists) is Paul Ehrlich, of *The Population Bomb* infamy (a 1968 best-seller). He is still in the catastrophe business despite some of his earlier whoppers, such as (from the cited book): “The battle to feed all of humanity is over. In the 1970s hundreds of millions of people will starve to death in spite of any crash programs embarked upon now.” Nope.

He has also warned: “The death rate will increase until at least 100-200 million people per year will be starving to death during the next ten years [1970-1980].” Didn’t happen. And Ehrlich predicted that between 1980 and 1989, around four billion people, including 65 million Americans, would perish in what he called the “Great Die-Off.” Missed that one too. *Juuust* a bit outside, in the famous call of sportscaster Bob Uecker.

Today, Ehrlich and his colleagues want to “stabilize” millions of us as soon as possible — apparently for our own good.

There have been numerous eco-cataclysms that didn’t pan out, though they were widely predicted by the presumed doyens. Dr. Laura Williams compiled some for the Foundation for Economic Education. As she wrote, “Alleged experts in biology and zoology predicted that of all species of animals alive in 1970, at least 75 percent would be extinct by 1995.” She also pointed to the ubiquitous doomsayer Ehrlich and his spurious claim that, by 1985, “all important animal life in the sea will be extinct.”

Yet today’s youngsters may still believe that well-publicized authorities are infallible. They could be truly afraid. Think, in this regard, of Swedish teen Greta Thunberg, the child activist who wailed before the United Nations: “We are in the beginning of a mass extinction!”

Some grown-ups, who should know better, are also apparently frightened. Consider *New York Times* environmental reporter Cara Buckley, who recently penned a long piece for that paper entitled “Is There a Cure for My Climate Grief?” For therapy she flew — imagine the carbon emissions! — to Alaska for a kayaking trip “to see glaciers while they still exist.” The piece had a good deal more, if you can stand it, including her being helped by the work of an “environmental grief activist.”

Others of us who have been around for a while recall previous bogus projections. For example, there were scare stories in the mid-1970s in *Newsweek* and *Time* (very influential magazines at the time) with features about “The Cooling World” and “A New Ice Age?”

Then the tale changed. And, lo, before long we are going to be toast. We are now instructed that we will be swept away by rising oceans caused by hothouse Earth. However, Al Gore still has multiple houses. And fellow greenie Barack Obama doesn’t seem personally worried about the future; he has just bought a mansion, costing a bit under \$15 million, near the perfidious sea on Martha’s Vineyard.

On the other hand, columnist Kurt Schlichter, who is a trial lawyer and a retired Army infantry colonel, calls “climate change” a hoax. (He says climate changes continually, and always has.) He too recalls past forewarnings of doom, saying in a recent article for Townhall.com:

Back in the 70s, I remember we were promised an ice age if we didn’t give liberals our money and freedom. Then in the 80s, we were promised death by ozone hole if we didn’t give liberals our money and freedom, and then doom by acid rain if we didn’t give liberals our money and freedom. By the time



Written by [William P. Hoar](#) on December 23, 2019

Published in the December 23, 2019 issue of [the New American](#) magazine. Vol. 35, No. 24

they started promising that we were all gonna die from global warming if we didn't give liberals our money and freedom, I was still wanting my ice age. It would be nice to have a white Christmas in LA.

With doomsayers' horrible track record, we can be fairly assured that climate change will not cause devastation, but the *response* to the professed threat of climate change could lead to actual dire consequences. While the Federal Reserve in this country says it is resisting demands to use its powers against "climate change," that is not the case in other developed nations. The *Wall Street Journal* noted in mid-November that other central bankers

have been all too happy to join the climate-change virtue parade. The European Central Bank has bought "green" bonds financing renewable energy, though environmentalists also want it to ditch assets in fossil-fuel companies. Sweden's central bank this week dumped government bonds from Alberta, Canada, and Queensland, Australia, because of their high emissions.

Then there's the Bank of England, which plans to incorporate global warming and government climate policies in its bank stress tests. This means that banks will be punished if they hold assets in fossil fuels.

And don't expect thorough coverage on false climate claims by Big Media. The Daily Caller News Foundation (DCNF) just exposed details about how more than 200 "media outlets and journalists partnered together with activists to coordinate and hype climate change news before the 2019 U.N. climate summit." Indeed, according to reporter Chris Ward, many did not even make public that coordination.

"Large parts of the mainstream media have stopped pretending to strive for objectivity in their reporting," commented Myron Ebell, director of the Competitive Enterprise Institute's Center for Energy and Environment. He told the DCNF: "On the climate issue, many outlets and reporters are now publicly boasting about the fact that they are promoting their own prejudices on the grounds that increasing global energy poverty is a noble cause."

It used to be considered a laughing matter to notice that the weatherman is the only person who is repeatedly wrong and still gets to keep his job. Today that is the case with climate-disaster predictors, and it is not a joke.

Our descendants may well judge that we all have been stricken by madness. One who is decidedly not mad is Richard Lindzen, a Harvard-educated American atmospheric physicist who for three decades until his retirement in 2013 was Alfred P. Sloan Professor of Meteorology at the Massachusetts Institute of Technology.

As Lindzen has put it: "Future generations will wonder in bemused amazement that the early 21st century's developed world went into hysterical panic over a globally averaged temperature increase of a few tenths of a degree, and, on the basis of gross exaggerations of highly uncertain computer projections combined into implausible chains of inference, proceeded to contemplate a roll-back of the industrial age."

— William P. Hoar

Photo credit: AP Images



Written by [William P. Hoar](#) on December 23, 2019

Published in the December 23, 2019 issue of [the New American](#) magazine. Vol. 35, No. 24

Subscribe to the New American

Get exclusive digital access to the most informative,
non-partisan truthful news source for patriotic Americans!

Discover a refreshing blend of time-honored values, principles and insightful perspectives within the pages of "The New American" magazine. Delve into a world where tradition is the foundation, and exploration knows no bounds.

From politics and finance to foreign affairs, environment, culture, and technology, we bring you an unparalleled array of topics that matter most.



Subscribe

What's Included?

- 24 Issues Per Year
- Optional Print Edition
- Digital Edition Access
- Exclusive Subscriber Content
- Audio provided for all articles
- Unlimited access to past issues
- Coming Soon! Ad FREE
- 60-Day money back guarantee!
- Cancel anytime.